DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 054 TM 002 870

AUTHOR	Forsyth, Robert A.; And Others
TITLE	Iowa Testing Programs Research Report. Perceptions of Iowa Teachers Related to the Use of ITED Results by Administrators and Counselors.
INSTITUTION	Iowa Testing Programs, Iowa City.
REPORT NO	ITP-RR-4
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Iowa Testing Programs, The University of Iowa, 334 Lindquist Center for Measurement, Iowa City, Iowa 52242 (no price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement Tests; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Educational Environment; English; *Perception; Questionnaires; Sciences; Social Studies; Standardized Tests; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Technical Reports; *Testing; *Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	Iowa; *Iowa Tests of Educational Development; ITED

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey conducted to determine the perception of teachers of the climate surrounding the administration of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) are presented. The results are related to the following two questions: (1) Do teachers feel that the test results are being used by teachers, administrators, and counselors? (2) If the answer to the first question is "yes," do teachers feel that they know how the test results are being used by these groups? A questionnaire was sent to teachers of English, science, and social studies. Results are given. It is concluded that standardized achievement tests provide information of potential value to students, parents, teachers, counselors, administrators, school board members, and the pupil at large. It was found that too little communication may occur in the schools, as a significant proportion of the respondents to the questionnaire profess to be uninformed about how other groups use the results. (CK)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IOWA TESTING PROGRAMS RESEARCH REPORT

NUMBER 4—MARCH 1973

Perceptions of Iowa Teachers Related to the Use of ITED Results by Administrators and Counselors

ROBERT A. FORSYTH
LEONARD S. FELDT
DALE C. BRANDENBURG

Published by the Iowa Testing Programs, The University of Iowa
334 Lindquist Center for Measurement, Iowa City, Iowa 52242

ED 078054

TM 002 870

IOWA TESTING PROGRAMS

RESEARCH REPORT

Perceptions of Iowa Teachers Related to the Use of ITED Results by Administrators and Counselors

Robert A. Forsyth and Leonard S. Feldt
University of Iowa

Dale C. Brandenburg
University of Illinois

INTRODUCTION

In September, 1970, the Twenty-ninth Annual Fall Testing Program for Iowa High Schools was conducted by the Iowa Testing Programs. During the first 29 years, school participation grew from a relatively small percentage of the state's secondary schools to the point that approximately 90% of Iowa schools administered the Iowa Tests of Educational Development to all or some of their students in grades 9 through 12. (In 1970, students in 441 high schools took the ITED.)

When the tests were developed, it was expected that the results of such a battery would prove useful to students, teachers, counselors, administrators, and parents. If one may judge from the growth of the program, particularly during the 1960's, the tests have been serving some or all of their intended purposes with these groups.

During these 29 years, however, no formal attempt was made to gather detailed, systematic data related to the local uses of the test data. For the most part, the program director developed his impression of local practices from unsystematic sources such as high school visits, informal discussion with school personnel, conferences, and correspondence with counselors and administrators. These approaches, while highly informative, might also involve biases. A more systematic collection of data would assess more accurately the current perceptions of Iowa high school personnel concerning the ITED. We were curious about the answers to questions such as the following:

1. Is there adequate communication among teachers, counselors, and administrators about how each group uses the test results?

2. What help do local administrators and counselors give in interpreting and using ITED results?

3. How useful are the tests to the various school groups, including students?

Answers to these questions, it was felt, could be helpful in planning for the future of the Fall Testing Program, in designing more helpful interpretative materials for teachers, and in providing school personnel with information related to the ITED testing program in other schools.

While the views of all school personnel were deemed important, the decision was made specifically to investigate the perceptions of Iowa high school teachers related to the use and administration of the ITED because teacher feedback to the program directors has been more sketchy, over the years, than that from counselors and administrators.

The need for teacher support of a school's program is obvious. If teachers convey the impression that administration of a standardized test is merely a chore, producing no real benefits to themselves, then it is likely that students will develop a negative attitude toward the test. If students do not see any benefits (either personal benefits or benefits to the faculty), they are unlikely to exert their best efforts and the validity of the testing will suffer.

These considerations were paramount in the decision to conduct a statewide survey of teachers, with particular emphasis on their perceptions of the climate surrounding the administration and use of the ITED in their schools. Portions of the results from this survey are presented in this report. Basically, these results are related to the following two questions: (1) Do teachers feel that the test results are being used

by teachers, administrators, and counselors? (2) If the answer to the first question is "yes," do teachers feel that they know how the test results are being used by these groups?

PROCEDURES

Construction of the Questionnaire

The development of a questionnaire to be sent to high school teachers was begun during the spring of 1970. Publications such as Teachers and Testing by David A. Goslin (1967) and A Study of Testing Practices in Minnesota Public Schools by Edwin G. Joselyn (1967) were used as resource materials in preparing initial drafts of the questionnaire. During the summer of 1970, a preliminary draft of the instrument was administered to a small sample of teachers from Iowa high schools who were attending summer school at the University of Iowa. On the basis of these results, several modifications in the questionnaire were made.

One characteristic of the final form of the questionnaire deserves special mention. Many of the questions were basically of the open-ended type rather than multiple-choice with specified responses. Although such questions make data analysis much more difficult, it was felt that these free responses would be revealing. In a questionnaire of this sort, it is difficult to anticipate the many variations and shadings in responses. Use of open-ended questions avoided the possibility that the authors' preconceptions would restrict the range of teacher opinion.

Selection of the Sample

Since some of the desired information pertained to administrative practices within a school building rather than to individual teacher opinions, it was considered appropriate to use the school building as the

unit of sampling. Furthermore, since the questionnaire contained several items related to the use of the ITED, it was decided to select the schools from the list of participants in the 1970 Fall Testing Program. At the time the sample was selected, 441 high school buildings had enrolled in the Program. These included 403 public high schools (86% of the total in Iowa) and 38 private schools.

A forty percent sample of schools within each of three size categories was selected.* The size categories were the same as those used for reporting norms for building averages on the ITED. Table 1 shows the actual number of buildings registered and the number chosen.

TABLE 1

Number of Schools Registered and Number Selected

Size Category	*Registered*	*Selected*
1	*136*	*55*
2	*127*	*51*
3	*178*	*71*
All Schools	*441*	*177*

Within each school, teachers were selected at random from three areas: English, science, and social studies. In addition, one teacher was chosen with a major teaching commitment outside these areas.** A total of 695

*Size 1--Enrollment 350 or more; Size 2--Enrollment 200-349; Size 3--Enrollment under 200.

**Since lists of teachers within private schools were not available (13 private schools were in the sample), the questionnaire was sent to the chairman of the department in each of the three major areas. No questionnaire was sent to teachers in the "other" area. Thus, only three questionnaires went to each of the 13 private schools.

questionnaires were sent to 177 high school buildings during November, 1970. Since the majority of schools had received their results from the 1970 Fall Program during October and the first part of November, the questionnaire should have reached the teachers at a very opportune time. Recency of contact with the test administration and results should have heightened the reliability of the respondents' reported reactions to the program.

Returns of Questionnaires

Approximately two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter was sent to those teachers who had not returned the questionnaire. Two weeks after the follow-up letter, a list was prepared of those schools in which two or more teachers had not replied. New teachers within the same teaching area as the non-respondents were selected and the questionnaire was mailed to them. No follow-up of this second group was undertaken.

Table 2 shows the number of schools with 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 teachers returning the questionnaire. It can be ascertained from the data in Table 2 that one or more questionnaires were received from 93% of the schools (165 out of 177).

Table 3 presents the number of returns by teaching area. It is obvious that teachers in all areas did not exhibit the same tendency to return the questionnaire. Surprisingly, those teachers in "other" areas showed the greatest return rate. In all, only 54% (376 out of 695) of the teachers returned the questionnaire.

TABLE 2

Number (and Percent) of Schools with 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 Teachers Returning the Questionnaire

	Number (and Percent) of Teachers Returning Questionnaires				
	0	1	2	3	4
1(N = 55)	3(5.5)	10(18.2)	17(30.9)	16(29.1)	9(17.3)[a]
2(N = 51)	2(3.9)	12(23.5)	15(29.4)	20(39.2)	2(4.2)
3(N = 71)	7(9.9)	14(19.7)	30(42.3)	16(22.5)	4(6.3)
All Schools (N = 177)	12(6.8)	36(20.3)	62(35.0)	52(29.4)	15(9.1)

[a]*Percents in this column are based on public schools only, since only three questionnaires were sent to private schools.*

TABLE 3

Returns by Major Teaching Area

School Size	Number (and Percent) of Returns in Each Area			
	English	Social Studies	Science	Other
1(N = 55)	33(60.0)	28(50.9)	38(69.1)	29(55.8)[a]
2(N = 51)	23(45.1)	24(47.1)	27(52.9)	36(75.0)
3(N = 71)	31(43.7)	31(43.7)	37(52.1)	39(60.9)
All Schools (N = 177)	87(49.2)	83(46.9)	102(57.6)	104(63.4)

[a]*Percents in this column are based on public schools only.*

Analyses

When the survey was initiated, comparative analyses were contemplated on several dimensions: teaching areas, experience with tests, amount of teaching time, formal instruction (or lack of it) in educational measurement, and others. Since the return rate for teachers was lower than desired and expected, these analyses were not performed. It was felt that there was too great a risk of bias in the return of various subgroups to permit valid inferences on the basis of the available data. It is assumed, however, that even one teacher can supply valuable information regarding the use of the ITED and the attitudes of teachers and students toward the ITED within his building. Thus, analyses in which buildings are taken as the sampling unit were considered legitimate, despite the hesitancy of many teachers to return the questionnaire. Most of the results reported in the next section, therefore, are related to school buildings and not to specific teacher groups.

Results and Discussion

The following general format is used in reporting the results:

1. The question is quoted as it appeared in the questionnaire.
2. Data related to the questions are given, usually in table form.
3. Brief comments are given following the data for each question.

Three different types of comments are made for most questions. The first draws attention to some of the more obvious implications of the data in the table. The second type generally concerns relationships of the data to responses to other questions. Finally, for some questions, comments related to individual teacher responses are included. As noted earlier, because of the low return rate by teachers, these comments must be interpreted cautiously.

Question 16*

In your opinion, how useful are the ITED for each of the following groups?

	Very Useful (4)[a]	Of Some Use (3)	Of Doubtful Value (2)	Of Essentially No Use (1)
Administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____
Counselors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____
Students	_____	_____	_____	_____

[a]Numbers did not appear on the questionnaire. They represent the numerical values assigned to the categories for purposes of summarizing the response data.

The categories used for this question, although relatively crude, permitted teachers to make fairly meaningful differentiations regarding usefulness. For each school, the response of each teacher was assigned a numerical value (see question above) and the arithmetic mean for all teachers in that school was computed. An average of 2.5 was selected as the dividing point for reporting the results. This value was chosen since averages above this would seem to indicate that in these buildings the tests were perceived as of some use to the designated group. The results are given in Table 4.

*Question number represents the number given to that question in the questionnaire.

TABLE 4

Number (and Percent) of School Buildings with Average Rating Above 2.5 on the Question, "How Useful are the ITED for Administrators, Counselors, Teachers and Students?"

School Size	Group			
	Administrators	Counselors	Teachers	Students
1(N = 59)	29(55.8)	48(92.3)	38(73.1)	39(75.0)
2(N = 47)	36(76.6)	47(100.0)	40(81.6)[c]	37(77.1)[e]
3(N = 63)	46(74.2)[a]	59(93.7)	48(76.2)	41(65.1)
All Schools (N = 162)	111(69.9)[b]	154(95.1)	126(76.8)[d]	117(71.8)[f]

[a]Percent based on 62 schools
[b]Percent based on 161 schools
[c]Percent based on 49 schools
[d]Percent based on 164 schools
[e]Percent based on 48 schools
[f]Percent based on 163 schools

Comments:

(1) There was very little variation from one size category to another in the distribution of the ratings of usefulness. However, there was a slight tendency for a greater percent of teachers in the largest schools (size 1) to rate the usefulness of the ITED to the administrators below 2.5. These results may reflect the fact that implementation of the testing program and analysis of test results are often delegated to staff personnel in the larger schools. A smaller percentage of teachers in the smallest schools judged the ITED to be of some use to students.

(2) In 95% of the buildings, the teachers perceived the tests to be of some use for counselors. The corresponding percent was 77, 72, and

70 for teachers, students, and administrators, respectively. Thus, in a large majority of schools, responding teachers perceived the ITED test results as of some use to all four groups.

(3) Approximately 77% of the teachers (268 of 349) who responded to the administrator's part of this item checked "Of Some Use" or "Very Useful." This percent was 94 (338 of 360), 84 (304 of 362), and 74 (256 of 344) for counselors, teachers, and students, respectively.

(4) This item does not bear on the very important question, "Are the benefits worth the cost?" It was felt that obtaining valid answers to this question would be highly unlikely for two major reasons. First, it would be very difficult to quantify, in a meaningful way (to be later related to costs), what the benefits of a testing program were. Second, although the explicit costs of the ITED could be easily obtained from the superintendent, the additional expenses a school undertakes in using the results would be difficult to calculate.

(5) Also, it should be noted that a teacher who thinks test results are of little or no use to a certain group may attribute this to a variety of reasons. He or she may believe the group already possesses adequate information of the type yielded by the test; hence, the data are of little use because they are redundant. Another possibility is that a teacher feels the tests fail to provide the kinds of data that are really needed by the group specified. A third possibility is that a teacher is convinced the group largely ignores the results and, thus, the results are not useful because their potentiality is not exploited. It was not

possible with the available data to determine which of these or other reasons prevail in the minds of those teachers who responded negatively.

Question 17

Do you feel that the majority of teachers in your school know how the ITED results are used by the administrators of your school?

_____1. Yes
_____2. No

If yes, how was this knowledge gained? (Check as many as appropriate.)

_____Special meeting regarding test results
_____Individual discussions with administrators
_____Discussions with other teachers
_____Other (Please specify) _____

If yes, what do you think is the major use of the results by the administrators? _____

TABLE 5

Pattern of Response, by School Size, to the Question, "Do you feel that the majority of teachers in your school know how the ITED results are used by the administrators of your school?"

School Size	*Number (and Percent) of Schools*		
	All Teachers Responding "Yes"	*All Teachers Responding "No"*	*Some "Yes" and some "No" responses*
1 (N = 52)	*8(15.4)*	*26(50.0)*	*18(34.6)*
2 (N = 49)	*7(14.3)*	*24(49.0)*	*18(36.7)*
3 (N = 64)	*5(7.8)*	*35(54.7)*	*24(37.5)*
All Schools (N = 165)	*20(12.1)*	*85(51.5)*	*60(36.4)*

Comments:

(1) The previous question (see Table 4) indicated that teachers in 70% of the buildings felt the ITED results were of some use to the administrators. In Table 5 it can be seen that in over 50% of the

schools surveyed, all responding teachers indicated that they felt the majority of teachers do not know how the ITED results were being used by the administrators. Furthermore, this was the response indicated by at least one teacher in approximately 88% (145 of 165) of the schools surveyed. Evidently teachers felt the results were being used but did not feel that their own faculty was informed regarding the specific uses of ITED by the administrators.

(2) Of all teachers responding to this question, 68% (252 of 368) checked "No."

(3) There was very little association between school size and responses to this question.

(4) There are several subtleties that should be noted with respect to these results. First, the respondent was asked to judge the understanding of the majority rather than his own knowledge. Possibly, this situation is analogous to that which occurs when teachers are asked if test results are misused or misinterpreted. In response to such a question, many teachers would probably answer, "Yes." But if they were asked "Do you frequently misinterpret these results?" there would be few who would respond, "Yes." Second, teachers may hesitate to proclaim they know, fully and completely, how someone else uses various bits of information. Perhaps they recognize the

possibility that the administrator has special skills, special reference data and special applications about which they are uninformed. In retrospect, it seems that the question doesn't guide the respondent very well with regard to the completeness of knowledge that justifies a "Yes." If the various administrative uses for the test results had been listed and then the teacher asked, "Do some or all of these uses of ITED results by administrators occur in your school?" the results might have been somewhat different. Third, even when the administrator has made a concerted effort to communicate how he is using the results, it is possible that the teachers did not believe he was being frank. In view of these considerations, the evidence is not conclusive regarding the adequacy of communication. At the very least, however, the data suggest that administrators should reexamine their communication efforts related to the ITED testing program.

(5) It would be informative to examine the degree of consistency in those schools where more than one teacher responded. There was disagreement between or among responding teachers in 43% of the large schools (18 of 42), 49% of the middle-size schools (18 of 37), and 50% of the small schools (24 of 48). In the sense of inter-respondent agreement, the reliability of the responses might be open to question. However, such disagreements can be viewed as further evidence that a systematic effort has not been made to discuss the administrative uses of test results with teachers.

(6) There was a slight association between responses to this question and the previous one (16). Of the 110 teachers who checked "Yes"

to this question and also responded to question 16, 85.4% perceived the results as "Of Some Use" or "Very Useful" to administrators. For the 235 teachers responding "No" to this question and also responding to question 16, 72.8% checked either "Of Some Use" or "Very Useful" for question 16.

(7) For those teachers who indicated that a majority of teachers know how the ITED results are used by administrators, approximately 46% (53 of 116) reported that the knowledge came from special meetings, 39% (44 of 116) stated that the knowledge came from individual discussions with the administrators, and 38% indicated that the knowledge came from discussions with other teachers. (Percents do not add to 100, since it was possible for a teacher to check more than one method.)

(8) The major uses of the test results by administrators as perceived by those teachers checking "Yes" clustered into four areas:

Evaluate school program (36 responses)

Understand students (18 responses)

Scheduling (14 responses)

Recommendations (12 responses)

Question 18

Do you feel that the majority of teachers in your school know how the ITED results are used by the counselor(s) of your school?

_____1. Yes
_____2. No

If yes, how was this knowledge gained? (Cneck all that are appropriate.)

_____At special meetings regarding test results
_____Individual teachers discussing results with counselors
_____Discussions among teachers
_____Discussions with students
_____Other (Please specify) _____
_____

If yes, what do you think is the major use of the results by the counselor(s)? _____

TABLE 6

Pattern of Response, by School Size, to the Question, "Do you feel that the majority of teachers in your school know how the ITED results are used by the counselor(s) of your school?"

School Size	*Number (and Percent) of Schools*		
	All Teachers Responding "Yes"	*All Teachers Responding "No"*	*Some "Yes" and some "No" responses*
1(N = 52)	*19(36.5)*	*10(19.2)*	*23(44.2)*
2(N = 49)	*11(22.4)*	*15(30.6)*	*23(46.9)*
3(N = 63)	*16(25.4)*	*22(34.9)*	*25(39.7)*
All Schools (N = 164)	*46(28.0)*	*47(28.7)*	*71(43.3)*

Comments:

(1) From a comparison of the data in Tables 5 and 6, it seems reasonable to conclude that teachers felt they had a greater knowledge of counselor use than administrator use of ITED results. However, in a sizeable proportion (29%) of the schools all teachers responded "No" to this item. Furthermore, in 72% (118 of 164) of the schools, one or more teachers perceived lack of knowledge by teachers (i.e., responded "No") about how counselors use test scores. The ideas discussed in Comment (4) after Table 5 apply to these data also.

(2) A slightly greater proportion of the largest schools had one or more teachers check "Yes."

(3) Of all teachers responding to this item, 48% (177 of 368) checked "No."

(4) These results show some consistency with the results found for the previous question related to knowledge of how administrators use test results. In both questions a large group of respondents was unwilling to claim that most teachers understand how the data are used. Of the 175 teachers checking "No" to question 18, 92.6% (162) also checked "No" to question 17. For the 187 teachers responding "Yes" to 18, only 46% responded "No" to question 17. This may indicate a lack of communication of test usage in many schools. However, in some instances the response may reflect the belief that counselors have specialized techniques which are not familiar to the typical teacher.

(5) Practically all teachers who checked "Yes," indicated that the knowledge was gained from special meetings, discussions with counselors, and/or discussions with other teachers. Only 11 teachers indicated that the knowledge was gained in discussions with students.

(6) The major uses of test results by counselors as perceived by the responding teachers were classified into three somewhat related areas:

College and/or other future educational decisions (72 responses)

Understanding students in order to help them now (40 responses)

Placement and/or advising for course selection (28 responses)

Question 3

During the past three years (1968-1969, 1969-1970, 1970-1971) were any meetings devoted to a discussion of the ITED tests held prior to the administration of the tests? (If you have not taught in your present school for the past three years, please check with some teachers who have been in the school during these years.)

_____1. Yes
_____2. No

If yes, which of the following topics were discussed? (Check as many as appropriate.)

_____How to administer the tests
_____Student motivation for the tests
_____Uses of test results by administrative personnel
_____Uses of test results by counselors
_____Uses of test results by teachers
_____Other (Please specify) _____

Who conducted the meeting?

_____1. Counselor
_____2. Principal
_____3. Other (Please specify) _____

TABLE 7A

Pattern of Response, by School Size, to the Question, "During the past three years (1968-1969, 1969-1970, 1970-1971) were any meetings devoted to a discussion of the ITED tests held prior to the administration of the tests?"

School Size	Number (and Percent) of Schools		
	All Teachers Responding "Yes"	All Teachers Responding "No"	Some "Yes" and some "No" responses
1 (N = 52)	29(55.8)	7(13.5)	16(30.8)
2 (N = 49)	20(40.8)	12(24.5)	17(34.7)
3 (N = 64)	27(42.2)	12(18.8)	25(39.1)
All Schools (N = 165)	76(46.1)	31(18.8)	58(35.2)

TABLE 7B

Number (and Percent) of Schools Reporting Various Topics Discussed at Meetings Prior to the Administration of ITED

School Size	Administration	Student Motivation	Administrative Use	Counselor Use	Teacher Use
1 (N = 45)[a]	42(93.3)	38(84.4)	29(64.4)	32(71.1)	40(88.9)
2 (N = 37)	31(83.8)	25(67.6)	23(62.2)	24(64.9)	32(86.5)
3 (N = 52)	50(96.2)	34(64.4)	25(48.1)	26(50.0)	36(69.2)
All Schools (N = 134)	123(91.8)	97(72.4)	77(57.5)	82(61.2)	108(80.6)

[a]Number of schools which had at least one teacher check "Yes" to the first part of question 3 (See Table 7A)

Comments:

(1) The data related to the previous two questions (17 and 18) seem to indicate less than adequate communication between counselors and teachers and between administrators and teachers in many schools. One possible solution to this problem would be to conduct special meetings at which the purposes for giving the ITED could be discussed. Question 3 requested information about such meetings.

(2) In approximately 81% of the schools, at least one teacher indicated that one or more meetings involving ITED had been held during the previous three years. However, in approximately 54% of the schools at least one teacher said such meetings were not held. In fact, for the 129 schools with two or more respondents contradictory information was received for 58 (45%) of the buildings. In these schools one teacher checked "Yes" and at least one checked "No." This disagreement on a factual question was disappointing. It may be

attributable to the simple process of forgetting in some cases. Another possible explanation might be in differing interpretations of the idea of a meeting. Perhaps some teachers interpreted this question to pertain to meetings devoted solely to a discussion of the ITED tests; others may have conceived a more general meeting at which ITED tests were discussed. Finally, a meeting might have been held that included some teachers but not others.

(3) There was very little association between school size and teacher reports of meetings. Meetings were recalled by at least one teacher in approximately 86.5% of the largest schools, 75.5% of the middle size category, and 79.7% of the smallest size category.

(4) The data in Table 7B indicate that the administration of the tests was the most frequent topic at the meetings. In 123 (92%) of the 134 schools where at least one teacher checked that a meeting was held, "How to Administer the Tests" was a topic discussed. Uses of test results by teachers was discussed at 81% of the meetings. Administrative uses and counselor uses were discussed at a relatively lower percent of the meetings (57.5 and 61.5, respectively).

(5) There was a relationship between responses by teachers to question 17 (knowledge of how administrators use test results--see Table 5) and responses to the part of this question related to a discussion of the use of test results by administrative personnel. In all, 368 teachers responded to both these questions. Of the 116 teachers

who indicated that they thought the majority of teachers know how the test results were used by administrators, 51 (44%) indicated that a discussion of such use had taken place at a meeting. Only 46 (18.3%) of the 252 who checked that the majority did not know how administrators use test results indicated that a discussion of such results had taken place.

(6) Three hundred and sixty-eight teachers responded to question 18 (knowledge of how counselors use test results--see Table 6) and also to question 3. Of the 191 teachers who thought the majority of teachers knew how counselors used the results, 78 (40.8%) indicated that a discussion of such use had taken place at a meeting; whereas, for the 177 teachers who thought the majority did not know how counselors used the results, 27 (20.9%) indicated that such a meeting was held.

(7) In the majority of schools (119 of 134) the meetings were conducted by either the counselor or the principal and counselor together.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Standardized achievement tests provide information of potential value to a number of groups: (1) students, (2) parents, (3) teachers, (4) counselors, (5) administrators, (6) school board members, and (7) the public at large. Not all members of each group have the same kind or degree of interest in the data. In almost every community there are individuals who attach considerable importance to the results, and others who have no interest in them whatsoever.

Each individual's attitude toward the school testing program will probably depend on the benefits he gains personally from it, and how much

he believes that it benefits others. If he uses the results frequently and knows that others use them, he is likely to support the program. If he makes no use of the results himself, but knows how and why other groups use them, his attitude will probably still be favorable. But if he does not use the data himself, and has never been informed about how others use it, his attitude will probably be negative. Furthermore, lack of information concerning the use of test results may invite speculation about their actual use. Such speculation often finds expression in concern about invalid and unfair uses of test results. Where this is the case, negative test attitudes are likely to be created and/or reinforced.

Very few teachers are inalterably convinced that test data are of no use to anyone. Frank discussion by administrators and counselors can probably convince all but a very small minority that the local testing program is valuable to many members of each audience. Open discussion can also convince open-minded individuals that the poor practices which some have been led to believe to be widespread are probably relatively uncommon. Communication among the various groups--particularly among administrators, counselors, and teachers--can usually serve to clarify how the first two groups are using the results.

The data presented in the foregoing sections suggest that too little communication may occur in many schools. A significant proportion of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire profess to be uninformed about how other groups use the results. In the absence of such information some of these teachers may not be willing to give administrators the benefit of the doubt and trust that valid uses are made of test results. Perhaps no

method of communication will convince a few of these individuals. But for many others, some relatively simple measures may be all that are required. If this is the case in any school, it would be unfortunate if these measures were not used.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Goslin, D. A. Teachers and Testing. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

2. Joselyn, E. G. A Study of Testing Practices in Minnesota Public Schools. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, 1967.